



Art and Craft in Proust's Life and Work

Citation

Greene, Virginie. 2015. Art and Craft in Proust's Life and Work. In Proust and the Arts, eds. Christie McDonald and François Proulx: 59-71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:30805482>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Open Access Policy Articles, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#OAP>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

Art and Craft in Marcel Proust's Life and Work

To the memory of Dorothy Kolb

“Good job” the English say. “Beau travail” disent les Français. The French have no work ethic. Instead, they have “la conscience professionnelle” and one phrase does not translate the other. If I had written this paper in French I would not have titled it “Art et artisanat dans la vie et l’œuvre de Marcel Proust.” “Craft” and “artisanat” allegedly refer to the same thing, but don’t have the same flavor.

From a broad perspective, French and Anglo-American cultures share a common history of labor, capital, industry, art, and craft, or, in one word, work. The linguistic differences I pointed out do not reveal two different cultures but two different styles within the same culture. In order to understand thoroughly the formation of these two styles, it would seem more appropriate to investigate economic, politic and social materials than the writings of a man who never had a job in his life. However, on matters of style, one can learn much from Proust, even when style is related to work in its concrete aspects.

In *Proust and Signs*, Deleuze claims that the unity of *In Search of Lost Time* is not provided by memory or time past: “Il s’agit, non pas d’une exposition de la mémoire involontaire, mais du récit d’un apprentissage. Plus précisément, apprentissage d’un homme de lettres.” [What is involved is not an exposition of involuntary memory, but the narrative of an apprenticeship: more precisely, the apprenticeship of a man of letters.]¹ For Deleuze, this apprenticeship consists in learning how to decipher signs. The essential craft of the man of letters is semiotic, which we should not be surprised to find in a book published in 1970. I do not deny the importance of signs in Proust’s novel, but I propose another way to understand the apprenticeship narrated in *In Search of lost time*, by shifting focus from semiotics to pragmatics, and from art to craft.

1) The man who could not make his bed.

Proust did not know how to make his bed. Why should he have known? He did not know how to hammer a nail either, to cut or joint pieces of wood, to sweep or wax a wooden floor, to wash dishes or polish silverware, to cook, bake, or make preserves, to paint or plaster a wall, to wash, mend, or sew clothes. I could add many more items on the list of things he never made, maintained or repaired, although he used them. It is easier to draw the list of manual and physical activities that members of the upper class could practice without demeaning themselves: sports like horseback riding, hunting, fencing, tennis, or golf, playing musical instruments such as piano or violin (not tuba or drums), practicing fine arts such as drawing, painting, or, less frequently, sculpture, gardening (with help from paid gardeners). Ladies practiced textile crafts, for decorative or charitable purposes. Some gentlemen might have known how to shave with a straight razor, probably not how to sharpen a razor blade. Two careers involving manual or physical activities were available for upper class men: the military and medicine.

Proust did not practice any of those gentle crafts, not even shaving. Céleste Albaret recounts that a *coiffeur* came to shave him at home. When the *coiffeur* was not available or Proust was too sick, he grew a beard.² What about his drawings? Proust practiced drawing in a deliberately skillless, craftless fashion, which is what makes them so endearing. Some of Proust's drawings parody specific art schools or movements. In a letter to Reynaldo Hahn, Proust explains that he has made thirty drawings which "constituaient une critique hardie des diverses écoles de peinture" [presented a bold criticism of the various schools of painting].³ All of them parody the art of drawing practiced in boudoirs and drawing rooms, and exhibit, to quote Françoise Leriche, "a critical eye... his caricatures clearly question... what we 'see' in works of art."⁴ They may also be an ironic tribute to John Ruskin.

Proust passed on all the available opportunities to let his inner *homo faber* flourish. Most people in his close entourage, though, practiced a craft or a profession involving manual skills. His father was a medical doctor, his brother a surgeon, his friends and lovers were musicians, painters, army officers, sportsmen, scientists, or gardeners. To pick one example, Robert de Montesquiou Fezensac could have been a

competent designer, had he not believed he was a Poet and had he not inherited his mother's industrial fortune.

The only thing Proust wanted to do was to write books, which was considered a decent activity for a gentleman, but was not one involving much craft, if we take craft as a direct, physical involvement with the physical world that surrounds us. However, it turned out that the man who could not make his bed was also a man who could not write a book.

2) The man who could not write a book.

The first book Marcel Proust authored appeared in 1896, under the title *Les Plaisirs et les Jours*, published by Calmann-Lévy, the publisher of Balzac and Anatole France.⁵ France provided a preface, Reynaldo Hahn the scores of four pieces for piano, and Madeleine Lemaire fifty illustrations. Each of these illustrations is signed. Twenty copies of *Les Plaisirs et les Jours*, printed on paper from the Imperial manufactures of Japan, include an original watercolor by Madeleine Lemaire, signed too. In total, she contributed seventy drawings or paintings.

The book has often be described as a failure. As François Proulx suggests, it is a failure if it is considered as a "commercial venture," and not so much if it is considered as part of "an economy of the gift."⁶ The problem may also be that *Les Plaisirs et les Jours* is not a book, but a breviary of 1890s aesthetics and a luxury object. It would have been more truthful to present this object as "*Les Plaisirs et les Jours*, a picture book by Madeleine Lemaire, with texts by Marcel Proust and music by Reynaldo Hahn." But Proust could not help thinking he was writing *his* book. In other words, he had picked the wrong mold and the wrong recipe for his cake.⁷

His next writing project too failed to become his book, but in a different way. This time, Proust tried to bake a cake without a mold and with too many recipes. No book came out of it, at least during Proust's lifetime. The manuscript called *Jean Santeuil* contains the beginning of an introduction: "Puis-je appeler ce livre un roman? C'est moins peut-être et bien plus, l'essence même de ma vie, recueillie sans y rien mêler, dans ces heures de déchirure où elle découle. Ce livre n'a jamais été fait, il a été récolté." [May I call this book a novel? It is perhaps less and much more,

the very essence of my life gathered without blending anything into it during the hours when, torn apart, it pours out. This book has never been made: it has been harvested.]]⁸ Precisely. In the practice of any craft, a moment comes when one has to move from the preliminary steps of gathering materials and tools, choosing patterns or designs, trying, testing, sketching, planning, or measuring toward the first decisive gesture, whether it is a cut, a stitch, a stroke, a broken egg, or a word on a sheet of paper. Proust did not reach that stage as he worked on *Jean Santeuil*. He did in a subsequent project, which seemed even more doomed to fail than *Jean Santeuil*: the “essay on Sainte-Beuve and Flaubert” morphing into a conversation with Maman, which became *In Search of Lost Time*.⁹ Between *Jean Santeuil* and the essay on Sainte-Beuve, Proust translated Ruskin.

3) Translating Ruskin.

No one today would deny the importance of the Ruskinian phase in Proust’s life and work.¹⁰ Several scholars consider that one important thing Proust learned during this phase is the discipline of working. Antoine Compagnon insists that on one point Proust always remained in agreement with Ruskin: “le sens de la discipline, la foi dans le travail” [sense of discipline and faith in work].¹¹ It is true that Ruskin had a long, productive career as writer, art critic, scholar, and public figure, and that he wrote extensively about work, labor, discipline, art, and craft. There is also ample proof that Proust worked hard and productively in order to publish *La Bible d’Amiens* and *Sésame et les Lys*, which critics praised for the quality of the translation, introductions, and notes. Still, the idea of Marcel Proust learning work ethic from John Ruskin sounds counterintuitive, if by work ethic we understand tidiness, organization, productivity, reliability, regularity, method, control, mastery, and anything else that may enable someone to deliver.

Ruskin would ask “Deliver what?” Describing an “imposing iron railing” installed in front of a pub in Croydon, with the result that the tiny space thus delimited became “a protective receptacle of refuse, cigar-ends and oyster-shells”, Ruskin concludes that this masterpiece of urban design “represented a quantity of work, partly cramped and deadly, in the mine; partly fierce and exhaustive, at the

furnace; partly foolish and sedentary, of ill-taught students making bad designs: work from the beginning to the last fruits of it, and in all the branches of it, venomous, deathful, and miserable.”¹² For Ruskin, most of the work done in England is wasteful, ugly, and unethical. On the contrary, “generally, good, useful work, whether of the hand or head, is either ill-paid, or not paid at all.”¹³ Moreover, “none of us, or very few of us, do either hard or soft work because we think we ought; but because we have chanced to fall into the way of it, and cannot help ourselves.”¹⁴ Ruskin praises work and rejects idleness, but never defines a clear, simple work ethic. Between deprecations and praises, Ruskin’s work ethic looks like a dogged impulse to continue to work without faith in the worth or usefulness of the work, and without hope for a just reward or recognition.

What type of worker was Ruskin himself? In the words of John Batchelor, “his editors make Ruskin seem, grand, majestic and *tidy*. In reality, he was never tidy, though to be untidy is not to be incoherent.”¹⁵ Ruskin worked enormously, in part to realize the contradictory dreams of his father, John James Ruskin, trader in sherry and reader of Byron. Ruskin senior wanted his son to be a successful genius, an inspired capitalist, and a hard working dilettante. This is an insane program that Ruskin junior fulfilled, insanity included. In 1852, Ruskin (who was then thirty-three) wrote his father to defend his project of writing about Venice instead of continuing the successful series on *Modern Painters*:

I cannot write anything but what is *in* me and interests me. I never could write for the public—I never *have* written except under the conviction of a thing’s being important, wholly irrespective of the public’s thinking so too—and all my power, such as it is, would be lost the moment I tried to catch people by fine writing. You know I promised them no Romance—I promised them Stones.¹⁶

This romantic posture is an affirmation of Ruskin’s *conscience professionnelle*. The phrase “work ethic” presents work as a social virtue, whereas “*conscience professionnelle*” presents work as a personal obsession. My work ethic makes me feel responsible of my work in front of others; my *conscience professionnelle* makes me continue to research, read, and write, until *I* am satisfied or throw the towel in despair. Both are necessary for the accomplishment of any difficult work, but are

more often than not in conflict with one another. Such a conflict can be at once productive and destructive, as the massive and untidy *œuvre* of John Ruskin shows.

Among the travails that Ruskin's style renders so accurately, craft appears as an element of peace, joy, and stability. Ruskin practiced drawing all his life with great pleasure and talent. Craft is also the ideal form of work he envisions in his utopian writings, and the exercise of fundamental faculties such as observation, ingenuity, memory, imagination, and patience. "I am essentially a painter and a leaf dissector" Ruskin wrote in 1860.¹⁷

Ruskin mentions, describes, and praises many crafts, including the craft of the translator, in the chapter of the Bible of Amiens dedicated to "The Tamer of Lions." Ruskin defends Saint Jerome, saint patron of translators, against protestant contempt by saying that "he represents, in his total nature and final work, not the vexed inactivity of the Eremite, but the eager industry of a benevolent tutor and pastor."¹⁸ In Proust's translation: "il représente dans sa nature entière et dans son œuvre finale, non pas l'inactivité chagrine de l'Ermite, mais le labeur ardent d'un maître et d'un pasteur bienfaisants."¹⁹ Further, Ruskin describes Jerome's industry not as the conscious fulfillment of divine orders but as an art and a craft: "partly as a scholar's exercise, partly as an old man's recreation, the severity of the Latin language was softened, like Venetian crystal, by the variable fire of Hebrew thought."²⁰ In Proust's translation: "Ce fut moitié exercice d'écrivain, moitié par récréation de vieillard qu'il se plut à adoucir la sévérité de la langue latine ainsi qu'un cristal vénitien, au feu changeant de la pensée hébraïque."²¹ Proust translates "scholar's exercise" as "exercice d'écrivain," and gives more agency to the translator in turning the passive "the severity of the Latin language was softened" into the active "il se plut à adoucir la sévérité de la langue latine." If I retranslate Proust's translation in English, and take it as a description of what *he* is doing, I obtain: "Partly as a writer's exercise, partly as a young man's recreation, the softness of the French language was hardened, like Venetian crystal, by the variable fire of Ruskin's thought." The French find English a little bit harsh to the ear and rough to the palate, but admire its precision. Describing a dress, Proust writes in *Le côté de Guermantes*, "la robe, dont le corsage avait pour seul ornement d'innombrables

paillettes soit de métal, en baguettes et en grains, soit de brillants, moulait son corps avec une précision toute britannique.²²” [her gown, the bodice of which had for its sole ornament innumerable spangles (either little sticks and beads of metal, or brilliants), moulded her figure with a precision that was positively British.]²³ Proust wrote this sentence with a precision that was positively British and an eye for well-crafted objects that was positively Ruskinian.

In reading and translating Ruskin, Proust found ways to resolve his own problems with work and career. Like Ruskin, he had to please his parents by demonstrating a work ethic while fulfilling his still inchoate *conscience professionnelle*. Like Ruskin, he had to transform an overprotected child into a worker without killing the child’s creativity. Like Ruskin, he had to handle inner demons such as guilt, hypochondria, and unspeakable loves. Translating Ruskin meant assessing the risks of using the deep inner self as the source of a work ethic and the foundation of a work practice. Thus, the psychotic guided the neurotic, and the neurotic understood the virtue of ergotherapy.

The late mad genius could not have helped the young aspiring writer if their encounter had not involved living persons, material objects, and real places. It is not enough to read, think, or write about craft. One needs to practice and to receive advice and training. One needs to establish a workshop—even if it turns out to be one’s bed.

Because of his limited grasp of English, Proust had to use consultants in order to translate Ruskin. A collaboration among artists produced *Les Plaisirs et les Jours*, but Proust, due to his age, was not the real master in this undertaking. When he decided to translate Ruskin, he became the *maître d’œuvre* of a layered process, involving collaborators whose tasks he alone determined. In this regard, Proust worked like saint Jerome, who used numerous consultants and helpers, including Jews and women.

4. Encounter with a craftswoman

Among these collaborators one is particularly important from the perspective of craft: Marie Nordlinger, who was Reynaldo Hahn’s second cousin. She

had studied fine arts at the School of Arts in Manchester, and specialized in metalwork. Reynaldo nicknamed her “Benvenuta Cellina.”²⁴

Marie Nordlinger met Proust in 1896. She had come to Paris to study sculpture and painting. She was twenty and Proust was twenty five. They became friends and met several times at Reynaldo’s parents place or in the salon of Madeleine Lemaire.²⁵ Marie Nordlinger played the role of an expert in English and Englishness for Proust, although she was a cosmopolitan English’s speaker rather than a pure “Brit.” More important than her knowledge of the language was the fact that she was, according to her memoirs, “a devotee of Ruskin, steeped in Pre- and Post-Raphaelite doctrine.”²⁶ In 1897, Robert de La Sizeranne’s book *Ruskin et la religion de la beauté* appeared, making Ruskin famous in France. In December 1899, Proust wrote Marie Nordlinger that he had begun “un petit travail absolument différent de ce que je fais généralement, à propos de Ruskin et de certaines cathédrales” [a small work completely different from what I usually do, about Ruskin and some cathedrals].²⁷

At first, Proust did not use Marie’s linguistic competence: his mother drafted a rough translation for him, and he consulted a few English or anglophone friends on specific terms or sentences. He started to consult Marie on Ruskin in early 1900, just after Ruskin’s death. This led him to discuss issues related to arts or crafts with her. In a letter dated March 1900, Proust responds to her claim that she had not learned how to write: “Ne vous plaignez pas de ne pas avoir appris. *Il n’y a rien à savoir*. Même ce qu’on appelle habileté technique n’est pas un savoir à proprement parler. [Do not complain for not having learned. *There is nothing to know*. Even what is called skill is not a knowledge in the strict sense]. Proust then explains that a scientific, learned relation to words does not lead to anything productive, but that technique, tact, or skill with words only starts when knowledge is forgotten.²⁸ In this letter, Proust describes the art of the writer as a craft in opposition to a science, which allows him to privilege involuntary memory over conscious knowledge. A craftswoman is less likely to intellectualize or theorize her work than a scientist, and she is less likely to believe she has absolute control over her materials.

Marie Nordlinger, after failing to be hired by Lalique, was hired by Siegfried Bing in the metal-workshop of *L'Art Nouveau*, in March 1903.²⁹ In June, she started to help Proust correcting the proofs of *La Bible d'Amiens*. She recalled that, during one of these sittings, Proust was intrigued by her Japanese cloisonné earrings: "So Ruskin was abandoned for the time being and I had to expatiate on the craft, origin, history, and the various forms of enamel."³⁰ She also wrote in the notes of her edition of Proust's letters to her, "Il était souvent question dans nos entretiens, de procédés techniques, car chacun de nous pratiquait son art et méprisait l'à peu près." [In our conversations, we often talked about techniques, for we both practiced an art and loathed approximations.]³¹

We can find another trace of Proust's conversations with Nordlinger in the preface of *Sésame et les Lys*, when Proust describes his bedroom in the vacation home where he locates his reading experiences as the antithesis of William Morris's theories:

Les théories de William Morris, qui ont été si constamment appliquées par Maple et les décorateurs anglais, édictent qu'une chambre n'est belle qu'à la condition de contenir seulement des choses qui nous soient utiles et que toute chose utile, fût-ce un simple clou, soit non pas dissimulée, mais apparente. [...] A la juger d'après les principes de cette esthétique, ma chambre n'était nullement belle, car elle était pleine de choses qui ne pouvaient servir à rien et qui dissimulaient pudiquement, jusqu'à en rendre l'usage extrêmement difficile, celles qui servaient à quelque chose.³²

William Morris's theories, which Maple and English designers constantly apply, dictate that a room is beautiful only if it contains things that are useful to us and only if any useful thing—even a simple nail—is not hidden but made visible. [...] According to these aesthetic principles, my bedroom was not beautiful at all, for it was full of useless things modestly dissimulating the useful ones, and even making them extremely difficult to use.

Marie Nordlinger was not a fan of the English Arts and Crafts movement.³³ She found her aesthetic home in the "Art nouveau" movement, which was greatly influenced by Ruskin's ideas about beauty and nature. If we accept Françoise Leriche's thesis that Proust is an Art Nouveau rather than an impressionist writer,

the role of Marie Nordlinger in the formation of his aesthetic takes an even greater importance.³⁴

This role has a material dimension, for their conversations were often triggered or centered on objects, including some that Marie Nordlinger made, such as a pink enameled hawthorn flower.³⁵ Once, she gave him a cheap toy that was available at Bing's store, the Japanese water flowers that eventually blossomed in a memorable cup of tea.³⁶ But the most important thing she gave him is the realization that art—any art—is craft, and that his personal, unique contribution to literature would blossom out of the practice of a humble craft, involving scissors and glue.

5) Draft as craft.

This pun is as bad as Doctor Cottard's puns, but, again, the linguistic differences between English and French can help us to reconsider one of Proust's singularities, his way of drafting. "Craft" comes from a germanic root meaning "power, strength, virtue." "Draft" comes from the verb "to draw" and would correspond to French "trait" from the verb "tirer," but has a different semantic range. Most important is the fact that "draft" is related to the craft of "drawing" (*dessiner*), and to the skill of "sketching." This semantic field involves precision, decision, strength, and planning.

"Brouillon" comes from the verb "brouiller," which comes from a germanic root that also gives "brouet" ("brew"). We are in the semantic field of brewing, stewing, concocting, mixing, blending, fusing, confusing. When "*brouillon*" is used as an adjective, it signals bad working habits. "*Elle est très brouillon*" is not a compliment. The term "*brouillon*" is most often associated with elementary school excercises. Pupils use (or used?) "*cahiers de brouillon*" for their excercises. "*Brouillon*" is so childish or elementary that artists prefer to use other words, such as "*esquisses*," "*croquis*," or "*premier jet*." In the most recent Pleiade edition of *A la recherche du temps perdu*, the section presenting excerpts from Proust's manuscripts is entitled "*Esquisses*."³⁷

The editors and authors of the essays published in *Proust aux Brouillons* had to work against the grain of the French language, in order to establish the importance, dignity, and beauty of Proust's unique way of drafting.³⁸ The title plays on the pictorial tradition of the *Christ aux outrages*, and on the etymological sense of *travail*, which is related to torture. In parallel to this critical volume, Nathalie Mauriac Dyer directs the publication of Proust's seventy five *cahiers* in fac-similes, presenting them as tools for research and objects of art.³⁹ Proust himself had realized the value of his *brouillons*, when he asked Gaston Gallimard to create a special deluxe edition of *A l'ombre des jeunes filles en fleurs*, including pages of his corrected proofs.⁴⁰

Thinking of Proust's drafting technique as a craft led me to think about its evolution. Since I have not been able to verify in the manuscripts themselves, I will present my thoughts as a series of questions and guesses.

When and how did Proust learn to draft a piece of writing? I suggest that he learnt that technique in elementary and high school, like everyone else in the French educational system of his times. He certainly used "*des cahiers de brouillon*," but did his teachers check the *brouillons* or did they only assess the final stage of assignments? Did they practice a pedagogy of rewriting? How did they give feedback? My guess is that the corrections were mostly interlinear, pointing out grammatical or stylistic problems on specific words and phrases. There might have been some training in the general building of an argument involving substitution, suppression, expansion, or displacement on a larger scale. I doubt this would have involved cutting and gluing pieces of paper together; it would have more likely involved scratching off and rewriting, in order to "*mettre au net*," the French expression that signifies the passage from the *brouillon* to the final version.⁴¹ This could be checked on the *Papiers Scolaires* kept in the Fonds Proust at the BnF, which contains samples of French compositions, translations from and into Latin, and a philosophical composition corrected by Alphonse Darlu.⁴²

How did Proust draft *Les Plaisirs et les Jours*? The response lies too in the fonds Proust, which holds manuscripts, dactylographies, proofs, placards and fragments. Yves Sandre, in his edition of *Les Plaisirs et les Jours*, remarks that neither

the dactylographies nor the placards include any correction by Proust, but that the different proofs show difference in the order of the pieces in the table of contents. The differences between the earlier versions (published in reviews) and the version published in the book indicate minute corrections, like “il devint cramoisi” corrected in “il devint très rouge”.⁴³ I suggest that Proust drafted and corrected these pieces in a “fine tuning” mode, without massive changes. The most important structural change he attended too (probably in consultation with Reynaldo Hahn and Madeleine Lemaire) is the order of the pieces in the volume.

How did Proust draft *Jean Santeuil*? The notes of Sandre show that he used notebooks and loose sheets, that some pages are not corrected at all, that the pages corrected are often difficult to read, and that he copied some parts of the manuscript in an attempt to move from *brouillon* to *mise au net*, but not in a neat fashion. Besides fine tuning, Proust uses another type of drafting: he seems to write by fragments or blocks of texts not yet definitely assigned a clear position in a final design. But what was the final design?

How did Proust draft his translations of Ruskin? The materials preserved in the fonds Proust include Mme Proust’s rough translation with annotations and corrections by Proust, manuscripts by Proust, corrected dactylographies, corrected proofs, and numerous documents including corrected placards of George Elwall’s translation of *The Crown of Wild Olive* and *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*. I suggest that, in his translations, Proust developed an extremely demanding method of rewriting, in which the text can be at any stage subjected to transformation on a small or large scale, and is constantly connected to other texts, through cross-referencing.

When and how did Proust learn to cut paper with scissors and to glue a piece of paper on the top of another? He most probably learnt at home with his mother or a domestic when he was very young. The same thing could be said about the few other material crafts that Proust practiced: handwriting, drawing and tracing.⁴⁴ The fact that Proust learned all these manual skills as a child is important. Crafting and drafting were probably a way for him to induce an unconscious labor, rooted in deep memory. When did he start to practice this method of collage with his manuscripts?

Céleste Albaret claims that she suggested that technique to him, for additions, and she did the cutting and glueing operations.⁴⁵ This accounts for some additions (the longest paperolles), but cannot account for displacements such as those described by Isabelle Serça in her study of interpolations in Proust's manuscripts. Serça assumes that Proust himself performed the cutting and glueing.⁴⁶ If he learned the craft at a very young age, he came to use it late in his life. Was it before he engaged in his final writing project (perhaps during his Ruskin phase), or during the project itself? When did he transform drafting into a craft, or an art?

I ask questions I cannot answer but which are answerable, I trust. It may be of particular importance in our times to retrace an aesthetic and pragmatic history of literature that integrates all levels of planning and execution from the most material to the most spiritual level, in order to understand better our own culture of cutting and pasting, workshops, and virtual realities.

¹ Gilles Deleuze, *Proust et les signes* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1964) p. 8. English translation: *Proust and Signs: The Complete Text*, trans. Richard Howard (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000) p. 3.

² Céleste Albaret, *Monsieur Proust*, trans. Barbara Bray (New York: New York Review Book, 2003), p. 85 (original French text: Paris: Laffont, 1973, p. 11-112).

³ Cited in: Caroline Szylowicz, "Les dessins dans les lettres de Marcel Proust à Reynaldo Hahn," in Jürgen Ritter and Reiner Speck eds., *Cher ami... Votre Marcel Proust: Marcel Proust im Spiegel seiner Korrespondenz: Briefe und Autographen aus der Bibliotheca Proustiana Reiner Speck* (Köln: Snoek, 2009) p. 47 [45-55]. Proust's letter is published in: Marcel Proust, *Correspondance*, ed. Philip Kolb, vol. 6 (Paris: Plon, 1970-1993) p. 103.

⁴ Françoise Leriche, "L'œil de Proust," p. ???

⁵ Marcel Proust, *Les Plaisirs et les Jours* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1896).

⁶ François Proulx, "'Irregular' Kin: Madeleine Lemaire, Reynaldo Hahn and Proust," p.?

⁷ Reference to François's essay. The whole paragraph needs to be rewritten.

⁸ Marcel Proust, *Jean Santeuil* précédé de *Les Plaisirs et les jours*, ed. Pierre Clarac and Yves Sandre (Paris: Gallimard, 1971) p. 181.

-
- ⁹ See Françoise Leriche's description of the different stages leading from the 1908 essai on Sainte-Beuve and Flaubert to the novel emerging in 1910. M. Proust, *Lettres: 1879-1922*, ed. Françoise Leriche and Katherine Kolb (Paris: Plon, 2004) p. 429-430.
- ¹⁰ See for instance Diane R. Leonard, "Proust and Ruskin 2000: 'Ces étoiles éteintes dont la lumière nous arrive encore' in Armine Kotin Mortimer and Katherine Kolb, eds., *Proust in Perspective: Visions and Revisions* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002) p. 213-226.
- ¹¹ Antoine Compagnon, "Introduction: A hue et à dia" in John Ruskin, Marcel Proust, *Sésame et les Lys* précédé de *Sur la lecture* (Paris: Editions Complexe, 1987) p. 22. See also Cynthia Gamble, *Proust as Interpreter of Ruskin: The Seven Lamps of translation* (Birmingham AL: Summa Publications, 2002) p. 9.
- ¹² John Ruskin, *The Crown of Wild Olive*, in *The Works of John Ruskin*, ed. E. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn, vol. 18 (London: George Allen, 1905) p. 387-388.
- ¹³ *Op. cit.* p. 422.
- ¹⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 419.
- ¹⁵ John Batchelor, *John Ruskin: No Wealth but Life* (London: Chatto & Windus, 2000) p. xi.
- ¹⁶ Letter of 18 February 1852. Quoted by J. Batchelor, *John Ruskin* p. 96.
- ¹⁷ J. Ruskin, *Time and Tide*, in *The Works*, vol. 17, p. 415. Quoted by J. Batchelor, *John Ruskin*, p. 96.
- ¹⁸ J. Ruskin, *The Bible of Amiens*, in *The Works*, vol. 33, p. 105.
- ¹⁹ J. Ruskin, *La Bible d'Amiens*, trans. Marcel Proust (Paris: Mercure de France, 1926) p. 217.
- ²⁰ J. Ruskin, *The Bible of Amiens*, p. 109.
- ²¹ J. Ruskin, *La Bible d'Amiens*, trans. M. Proust, p. 228.
- ²² M. Proust, *Le côté de Guermantes I*, in *A la recherche du temps perdu*, vol. 2, ed. J.-Y. Tadié (Paris: Gallimard, 1988) p. 353.
- ²³ M. Proust, *In Search of Lost Time*. Trans. C.K. Scott Moncrieff and T. Kilmartin. Revised by D.J. Enright, vol. 3 (New York: The Modern Library, 2003) p. 63
- ²⁴ P. F. Prestwich, *The Translation of Memories: Recollections of the young Proust* (London: Peter Owen, 1999) p. 55-56, p. 108, p. 109.
- ²⁵ See my entry "Marie Nordlinger" in M. Proust, *Lettres*, p. 1269-70.
- ²⁶ P. F. Prestwich, *Translation*, p. 60.
- ²⁷ Marcel Proust, *Lettres à une amie; recueil de quarante-et-une lettres inédites adressées à Marie Nordlinger 1889-1908* (Manchester: Editions du Calame, 1942) p. 5-6.
- ²⁸ M. Proust, *Lettres à une amie*, p. 17-18.
- ²⁹ P. F. Prestwich, *Translation*, p. 120.
- ³⁰ P. F. Prestwich, *Translation*, p. 125.
- ³¹ M. Proust, *Lettres à une amie*, p. 118.
- ³² J. Ruskin, M. Proust, *Sésame et les Lys*, p. 45-6. My translation.
- ³³ P. F. Prestwich, *Translation*, p. 174.
- ³⁴ Françoise Leriche, "Proust, an 'Art Nouveau' Writer?" (trans. Jane Kuntz) in A. K. Mortimer and K. Kolb, eds., *Proust in Perspective*, p. 202 [pp. 189-212].

³⁵ M. Proust, *Lettres à une amie*, p. 35 and note p. 118.

³⁶ M. Proust, *Lettres à une amie*, p. x.

³⁷ M. Proust, *A la recherche du temps perdu*, ed. Jean-Yves Tadié, Pléiade (Paris: Gallimard, 1987-1989). See for instance in volume 1, p. 631.

³⁸ Nathalie Mauriac Dyer and Kazuyoshi Yoshikawa, eds. *Proust aux Brouillons* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011).

³⁹ Marcel Proust, *Cahiers 1 à 75 de la Bibliothèque nationale de France*, ed. directed by Nathalie Mauriac-Dyer (Turnhout, Paris: Brepols, Bibliothèque nationale de France, 2008-).

⁴⁰ Letter to Gaston Gallimard, [7 novembre 1918]. M. Proust, *Lettres: 1879-1922*, p. 879.

⁴¹ French culture may be differing from Anglo-American culture in this regard. The importance of the *brouillon* could be related to the emphasis that, until a recent time, French school teachers set from the start on the formal, aesthetic qualities of writing and *presentation* (formatting) in school exercises.

⁴² See *Catalogue des nouvelles acquisitions françaises du département des Manuscrits. 1972-1986, nos. 16428-1875*, dir. Florence Callu and Annie Angremy (Paris: BnF, 1999) p. 20.

⁴³ M. Proust, *Jean Santeuil*, p. 10 and note p. 913.

⁴⁴ Proust traced numerous of his drawings for Reynaldo. See: C. Zsyłowicz, "Les dessins," p. 49-50.

⁴⁵ C. Albaret, *Monsieur Proust*, p. 327-328.

⁴⁶ Isabelle Serça, "Genèse de l'interpolation: l'art du montage" in *Proust aux Brouillons*, p. 45 [43-59].